

Remarks

The Applicant thanks the Office for the careful consideration given the present application in the initial Detailed Action in this matter. With the foregoing amendments and the ensuing remarks, the Applicant has endeavored to respond most properly to each of the issues raised in the Detailed Action to ensure that the specification and claims now presented are allowable in all respects. With this in mind, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office review and allow the current specification and claims.

In summary, the present application was filed with 33 claims in total with claims 1 and 20 standing independently. With the present amendment, claims 1 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 9, 17, 22, and 30 have been rewritten to stand independently, and a plurality of the remaining claims have been amended for proper dependency. Claims 2-19 and 21-33 are presented for consideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §§ 102, 103

In the Detailed Action, the Office rejected claims 1, 6, 14, 20-21, and 27 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,452,407 to Crook. The Office additionally rejected claims 2 and 3 as being rendered obvious by Crook when combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,246,468 to Dimsdale. Furthermore, the Office found claims 4-5, 7-8, 13, 15-16, and 28-29 unpatentable over Crook in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,530,652 to Croyle et al.

However, the Office did find that claims 9-12, 17-19, 22-26, and 30-33 were directed to patentable subject matter. The Office wrote that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form incorporating all limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

In reliance on the Office's indication, the Applicant has amended each of claims 9, 17, 22, and 30 to stand independently incorporating all limitations of each claim's base claim and those of all intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that each claim is in condition for allowance.

The Applicant further notes that—either as originally written or as amended herein—each of claims 2-8, 10-16, 18, 19, 21, 23-29, and 31-33 depends from a pending base claim. Therefore, the Applicant submits that each dependent claim is allowable not only because it depends from an allowable base claim but also because it adds patentable limitation thereto.

Conclusion

In light of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that all presently pending claims are directed to patentably nonobvious invention and are in condition for allowance in all respects. With this in mind, the Office's reconsideration and allowance of the specification and claims 2-19 and 21-33 are most respectfully requested.

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Detailed Action have been responded to fully. However, if, after consideration of the above amendments and

O'Connell Law Office
Application No. 09/852,446

PATENT
File Reference: CHKUS

comments, there remain any open issues in this application that possibly can be resolved by a telephone interview, then the Applicant's undersigned attorney most respectfully requests that he be called to discuss and attempt to resolve those issues.

July 29, 2004
Date

Respectfully Submitted,

TLPO2
Thomas P. O'CONNELL, Esq.
Reg. No. 37,997
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 20738
(781) 221-0060

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 29, 2004.

TLPO2
Thomas P. O'Connell, Esq.; Reg. No. 37,997
July 29, 2004
Date